

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination. This Amendment replaces the previously filed un-entered Amendment After Final Office Action dated November 4, 2009. Non-entry of said previously filed Amendment After Final Office Action is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, and 8 to 29 are pending in this application.

The Rejections under Prior Art

Claims 6 and 8-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Palmer (GB 2326505) in view of Rasmussen et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0053699) and Hajder et al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0277477). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As recognized in the Office Action, Palmer does not disclose the doorframe to be pivotally movable around a substantial vertical edge between an open position and a closed position, but instead around a horizontal edge. As recited in independent claim 6 with emphasis added, the

... two display monitors (28a, 28b) are positioned one above the other at an obtuse angle relative to each other and are *fixedly attached* to said doorframe (15) and said doorframe (15) is supported on said gaming machine cabinet (10) by a substantially *vertical* hinge to open and close said doorframe together with the two display monitors (28a, 28b) affixed thereto relative to said gaming machine cabinet (10)

The Office Action states that Palmer discloses "... at least two display panels of peripheral devices such as monitors affixed or mounted to said front wall structure (Page 8, lines 8-9) to be viewable through at least one opening (19; Fig 1) in the front wall structure when it is in the closed position , wherein the two display monitors are positioned one above the other at an angle relative to each other (Page 3, line 17 - Page 4, line 6 and lines 19-21)..."

However, Palmer does not disclose display monitors affixed to the front door frame. Referring to Palmer page 3, lines 17 to page 4 line 6, and to page 4, lines 14-16 and page 8, lines 8-9 of Palmer, what Palmer states in these passages does not support such an interpretation.

What Palmer states is as follows:

The control system of the invention may be used with any suitable kind or construction of entertainment machine. Most preferably, however, the machine has a cabinet with a main body part and a front wall structure comprising a mounted display panel with at least one said peripheral device associated therewith, which front wall structure can be moved relative to the said body part to open the cabinet for access to the interior thereof, whereby the (or at least one) said serial bus extends within the cabinet between the control unit mounted in the body part and the (or each) said peripheral device associated with the said display panel.

With this arrangement, the control system of the invention can be particularly advantageous. It is common practice to associate multiple peripheral devices with front panels of entertainment machines and the minimised cabling arrangement of the invention facilitates installation in this context.

Palmer, page 4, lines 14-16 states:

The front wall structure may be movably mounted via a hinge joint or the like and gas or hydraulic struts, or detachable fixed struts or the like may be provided to hold the wall structure temporarily in its open position.

Palmer, page 8, lines 8-11 states:

Also in the upper part 9 of the cabinet 1 behind the upper panel 11 there is mounted a display unit 27 comprising a bank of lamps 28, behind a printed track of a feature game. The bank of lamps 28 is fixed between the side walls 3.

Palmer does not disclose display monitors affixed to the doorframe. Palmer discloses flat glass panels 12 on the door. However, these are windows, not display monitors, and define window areas 19, 20. Palmer discloses peripheral devices associated with the front panel. However, the only such devices disclosed are press buttons 31 and slot 32. The lamps 28 are disclosed as being behind the upper panel 11. However, these lamps are fixed between the side walls 3 and therefore cannot be affixed also to the front door. In fact, Palmer explicitly states that all components 27-35 are separate from the front wall structure 7 to permit its opening (Palmer, page 8, lines 20-22).

Rasmussen et al. is cited for showing a cathode ray tube video monitor. The Office Action states:

Palmer does not disclose having two display monitors affixed to said doorframe; however substituting mechanical slot wheels with a mounted cathode ray tube monitor for a video display of the slot reels on a doorframe is notoriously well known in the art as evidenced by Rasmussen [0003 & 0027], Fig. 2 & 5.

However, the cathode ray tube monitor 60 of Rasmussen et al. is not affixedly mounted to the doorframe, but inside the cabinet. It does not move with the doorframe when the doorframe is opened and does not provide the advantages of the present invention as discussed below. Hence, Rasmussen et al. does not provide any disclosure or suggestion which would remedy the defects of Palmer. Neither of these references, whether taken individually or in combination, discloses or suggests all of the features as recited in the claims.

Hajder et al. is cited for disclosing that a cabinet door may be changed to open around a vertical axis rather than a horizontal axis. However, Hajder et al. is not valid as a prior art reference. The present application claims priority to the filing date of Australian application No AU 2003100844 (a copy of which is attached hereto), namely October 8, 2003. The Hajder et al. reference was published on December 15, 2005 and filed on June 9, 2004, after the filing of Applicant's Australian application. Hence, Hajder et al. is not prior art to the present application.

The Office Action states that it would be an obvious matter of design choice to change a front wall structure or cabinet door to open from vertically to horizontally because (1) it would still be possible to be viewable by a technician and (2) since applicant "has not disclosed that pivotally movable around a vertical edge solves any stated problem or is for any purpose other than opening and closing the doorframe and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the doorframe opening and closing around a vertical edge."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the comments in the Office Action. As noted in the specification:

A second important aspect to the doorframe is its ability to also allow an engineer or attendant to access all the internal workings of the gaming machine more readily. As both display means in a dual display gaming machine system will be accessible along with other internal components to the gaming machine whilst only having to open one door, the engineer or attendant as the case may be, will be relinquished of the burden of having to undo 2 locks, and hold both doors open whilst performing their work.

This advantage is achieved at least in part by having the display monitors mounted to the front door frame which is vertically hinged to the cabinet so as to open horizontally. The problem of accessibility by a technician and Applicants' solution to the problem is a feature

disclosed in the present application, not the prior art. The vertical hinging of the front doorframe is an aspect of that solution. None of the prior art references discloses or suggests this feature, and there is no foundation for the Examiner's assertion that the vertical hinge of the front doorframe is simply a matter of design choice.

A claim must be viewed as a functional whole, and not as a collection of disparate elements for which the Examiner can allege obviousness by picking and choosing from among similar elements in various patents in the prior art. It has not been shown why one skilled in the art would be motivated to fixedly attach display monitors in an obtuse angle relative to each other to a doorframe which swings open horizontally.

The rejection, therefore, is unsupported by the references and a prima facie case of obviousness is not established. Accordingly, claim 6 and all claims depending therefrom are submitted to be patentable. Likewise, independent claims 26 and 27 (as amended) are also submitted to be allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The New Claim

New Claim 29 depends from claim 6 and is directed to the vertex of the angled planes defined by the display monitors, i.e., that the vertex is located behind the doorframe. Support for this recitation can be found at page 6, lines 1-3 of the specification and the embodiments of Figures 1, 2 and 5 of the drawings. What is meant by the abovementioned feature of the actual

vertex of the angles meeting at a point located behind the doorframe is illustrated by the sketch appended hereto.


With regard to the advantages provided by such arrangement, it improves the ease of a player viewing the monitors on a multiple display gaming machine, whilst simultaneously allowing an attendant or worker to perform maintenance duties with more ease.

The ease of a player viewing the monitors is improved since the aforementioned arrangement with the vertex of the angles meeting at a point behind the doorframe comes along with a spacing between the two monitors so the human eyes can better keep apart the two monitors. On the other hand, the ease of a worker performing maintenance of the machine is improved, since the arrangement with the vertex being behind the doorframe provides for a better accessibility to the monitor edges facing each other. In particular, the lower edge of the upper monitor and the upper edge of the lower monitor may be better grabbed or a tool can be brought into contact with said edges easier as can be seen from the sketch in the attachment. While some of the prior art documents relating to two-monitor gaming machines show a spacing between the two monitors, none of the documents shows the vertex of the angles between the monitors meeting at a point behind the doorframe since the doorframe panel section between the two monitors is not angled to both monitors as shown in the sketch of the attachment.

Reply to the final Office Action of August 4, 2009

For at least the reasons stated above all of the pending claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance, the same being respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adrian T. Calderone', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Adrian T. Calderone

Reg. No. 31,746

Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
1000 Woodbury Road, Suite 405
Woodbury, New York 11797
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516